

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
10

11 WILLIE HENRY,
12 Plaintiff(s),

13 v.

14 DOVENMUEHLE MORTGAGE, et al.,
15 Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:19-cv-00360-MMD-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 37]

16 Pending before the Court is Defendant Experian's motion to stay discovery pending
17 resolution of its motion to dismiss. Docket No. 37; *see also* Docket No. 36 (motion to dismiss).
18 Although the motion to dismiss has been briefed, no response has been filed to the motion to stay
19 discovery and the deadline for doing so has expired. The motion is properly resolved without a
20 hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-1. Motions to stay discovery have been granted in other cases
21 presenting substantially similar circumstances. *See, e.g., Mintun v. Experian Info. Sols., Inc.*, 2019
22 WL 2130134 (D. Nev. May 15, 2019). The Court is persuaded that the same result should be
23 reached in this case, as well.¹
24

25 _____
26 ¹ The Court finds herein that Experian is entitled to a stay of discovery based on its motion
27 to dismiss. No other defendant has joined in the motion to dismiss or the motion to stay discovery
28 and, as such, discovery is not stayed with respect to any other defendant. *Cf. White v. American Tobacco Co.*, 125 F.R.D. 508, 509 (D. Nev. 1989). Nothing herein should be construed as prohibiting the filing of a request to extend the scope of the stay of discovery, however. The Court expresses no opinion on such a request.

1 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the motion to stay discovery is **GRANTED**. To the
2 extent resolution of the motion to dismiss does not result in termination of Experian as a party to
3 this case, a joint proposed discovery plan must be filed within 14 days of the resolution of that
4 motion.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: June 17, 2019

7
8 
9 _____
10 Nancy J. Koppe
11 United States Magistrate Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28